

REMARKS

Amendments

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8-11 are canceled without prejudice.

The amendments presented above rewrite claims 4, 7, and 12 in independent form. Claim 12 as originally filed was a duplicate of claim 7 because original claim 12 erroneously depended from claim 1 instead of claim 8 as intended. So, claim 12 as currently amended includes all the limitations of claim 8 (as that claim was previously amended).

Applicant seeks favorable reconsideration of claims 4, 7, and 12 as discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

Applicant urges the Examiner to please reconsider his decision to reject claims 4, 7, and 12, which are respectfully considered to be directed to allowable subject matter.

Claim 4 is rejected based on Carr in view of Ulevich and Hu. However, none of the references suggest flaring the fingers to increase frictional engagement of the insert with the inner wall of the socket. Although Hu shows a nut holder having fingers 211 with flared distal ends 212, the fingers 211 are slanted inwardly and then flare outward at the distal ends 212 for guiding the nut (see column 4, lines 11-14). The flared ends are not “elastically deformed when said insert is received by said socket, whereby said insert is held within said wrenching socket by friction” as claimed. This can be seen for example in Figs. 2-4 of Hu. Thus, it is asked that the rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 12 are rejected based on Carr in view of Ulevich and Hu, and further in view of Paul. Paul teaches a nylon wrench insert 24 having fingers 30 for gripping and retaining a spark plug 36 by engaging the insulator portion 40 of the spark plug. It is true that the engagement side of each finger is in the form of an arcuate concave surface. However, as can be seen in Fig. 1 of Paul, the fingers 30 do not engage the hexagonal nut portion 42 of the spark plug, but rather they engage the circular insulator portion 40. Thus, the insert is not used for transmitting torque and suggests that the engagement sides of an insert's fingers should be shaped in corresponding fashion to the structure engaged thereby. In the present invention of Claims 7 and 12, an arcuate surface is used to engage a flat surface because the arcuate surface has been found to function satisfactorily while providing manufacturing advantages (see the present application at paragraph [0019]). Therefore, favorable reconsideration of claims 7 and 12 is respectfully sought.

Conclusion

The present amendments raise no new issues, and the claims remaining in the application are thought to be allowable. Consequently, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, the undersigned attorney may be contacted at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

HODGSON RUSS LLP

By 

George L. Snyder, Jr.

Reg. No. 37,729

One M&T Plaza, Suite 2000
Buffalo, New York 14203-2391
(716) 856-4000
DATED: March 4, 2004

BFLODOCS 903214v1 (JCX@01!.DOC)